



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/683,235	12/05/2001	Gregory T. Grefenstette	D/A0A34	8303

25453 7590 11/21/2003

PATENT DOCUMENTATION CENTER  
XEROX CORPORATION  
100 CLINTON AVE., SOUTH, XEROX SQUARE, 20TH FLOOR  
ROCHESTER, NY 14644

EXAMINER

WOO, ISAAC M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2172

16

DATE MAILED: 11/21/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PP4

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/683,235	GREFENSTETTE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Isaac M Woo	2172	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 September 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 10-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 9 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is in response to Applicant's Amendments, filed on September 08, 2003, have been considered but are deemed moot in view of new ground of rejections below.
2. The applicant amended claims 1, 8, 14 and 18. And the pending claims are 1-20.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-8 and 10-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rennison et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,154,213, hereinafter, "Rennison").

With respect to claims 1, 13-14 and 18, Rennison discloses, the method, system and article of manufacture for computer system for automatically generating a query from selected document content, defining an organized classification of document content with each class in the organized classification of document content having

associated therewith a classification label (col. 8, lines 28-55, col. 18, lines 33-47), see (fig. 1, fig.10, col. 8, lines 4-63, col. 18, lines 33-47, col. 8, lines 63-67 to col. 9, lines 1-7); each classification label (col. 8, lines 28-55, col. 18, lines 33-47) corresponding to a category of information in an information retrieval system, see (col. 18, lines 33-47, col. 8, lines 63-67 to col. 9, lines 1-7, col. 18, lines 1-20-47); identifying a set of entities in the selected document content for searching additional information related thereto using the information retrieval system, see (col. 6, lines 29-39, col. 9, lines 22-35, 102, fig. 1, "topic" is called entity, col. 19, lines 25-67); categorizing the selected document content using the organized classification of document content for assigning the selected document content a classification label from the organized classification of content, see (fig.1, col. 8, lines 5-67 to col. 9, lines 1-16, col. 18, lines 14-57); and formulating the query to restrict a search at the information retrieval system for information concerning the set of entities to the category of information in the information retrieval system identified by the assigned classification label, see (col. 17, lines 55-67 to col. 18, lines 1-11, col. 18, lines 20-58, topic is entity discussed above, thus, query for topic is query for entity). Rennison discloses the identifying entities, categorizing documents, and formulating query as discussed above. Rennison does not explicitly disclose the "automatically" identifying entities, categorizing documents, and formulating query. However, the system of Rennison is for document classification and displaying document classification on computer system. The computer system is an automatic system and the steps of the identifying entities, categorizing documents, and formulating query in Rennison, do not require any user's action. Thus, all steps (the

identifying entities, categorizing documents, and formulating query) are automatically done by computer system. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art the time of the invention was made to include "automatically" in the system of Rennison to execute the steps of the identifying entities, categorizing documents, and formulating query automatically. Because the computer system is automatic system that executes computer executable programs automatically without a user's interventions to provides computer execution results to the user.

With respect to claims 2, Rennison discloses, limiting the query by adding terms relating to context information surrounding the set of entities in the selected document content, see (col. 21, lines 26-57, col. 26, lines 17-40).

With respect to claim 3, Rennison discloses, the number of terms added is limited to a predefined number, see (col. 21, lines 26-57, col. 26, lines 17-40).

With respect to claims 4, Rennison discloses, limiting the query by adding terms defining the assigned classification label, see (col. 21, lines 26-57, col. 26, lines 17-40).

With respect to claim 5, Rennison discloses, the organized classification of document content is defined using a hierarchical organization, see (fig.1, col. 8, lines 5-67).

With respect to claim 6, Rennison discloses, using a text categorizer to assign the classification label assigned from the organized classification of content, see (fig.1, col. 8, lines 5-67).

With respect to claim 7, Rennison discloses, extracting with the text categorizer a set of terms relating to the document content; and appending to the query ones of the set of terms extracted by the text categorizer to contextualize the query, see (fig.1, col. 8, lines 5-67).

With respect to claim 8, Rennison discloses, abbreviating the set of terms extracted by the text categorizer to a predefined limit of terms, see (col. 9, lines 17-67 to col. 10, lines 1-34).

With respect to claims 10-11, Rennison discloses, each class in the organized classification of document content has associated therewith a characteristic vocabulary, see (col. 8, lines 5-67, col. 9, lines 17-67 to col. 10, lines 1-34).

With respect to claim 12, Rennison discloses, enriching selected content of a document with personalities that identify enrichment themes, see (col. 8, lines 5-67, col. 9, lines 17-67 to col. 10, lines 1-34).

Art Unit: 2172

With respect to claims 15-16, Rennison discloses, short length aspect vector generator for generating terms relating to context information surrounding the set of entities in the selected document content; wherein the query generator adds the terms relating to the context information to limit the query, see (col. 21, lines 26-57, col. 26, lines 17-40).

With respect to claim 17, Rennison discloses, content manager for enriching the selected document content with results provided from the information retrieval system using the query, see (col. 4, lines 1-67 to col.5, lines 1-56).

With respect to claims 19, Rennison discloses, limiting the query by adding terms relating to context information surrounding the set of entities in the selected document content, see (col. 21, lines 26-57, col. 26, lines 17-40).

With respect to claims 20, Rennison discloses, limiting the query by adding terms defining the assigned classification label, see (col. 21, lines 26-57, col. 26, lines 17-40).

### ***Claim Objections***

5. Claim 9 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### ***Conclusion***

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Bloem et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,680,602) discloses the system for automatically starting an extract process in response to the committing of update data to a repository by an update process. In one embodiment, triggers are associated with particular extract processes and are started upon the committing of update data to the repository by an update process. Upon being started, each trigger determines whether any of the update data is within the extract view of the extract process that it is associated with and, if so, evaluates a predetermined condition specified for the trigger. If the condition is satisfied, the trigger translates the update data within the extract view into the extract view and starts the extract process. In another embodiment, triggers are bound to repository entities within the view of an extract process and are started upon the updating of the corresponding entities. Upon being started, each trigger evaluates a predetermined condition specified for entity post-image and, if the condition is satisfied,

adds the post-image to data being accumulated for the extract process. Upon the commitment of the update, all extract processes for which data has been accumulated are started after making available the data accumulated for the process.

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


***Contact Information***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Isaac M Woo whose telephone number is (703) 305-0081. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Y Vu can be reached on (703) 305-4393. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

IMW  
November 17, 2003

  
SHAHID ALAM  
PRIMARY EXAMINER